11:Levine Z-4,5 (1958-1961)1965 MP5 Amhara MP5

at social gatherings in the course of discussions about nearly any subject. One cannot but conclude that the Amhara litigate to a large extent because for them it is an intrinsically pleasurable activity. At times, in fact, the forms of litigation are acted out as in a game. *Teṭäyaq,* for example, analogous to the Western process of cross-examination and a beloved feature of traditional court procedure, is sometimes practiced at parties though it has been outlawed in modern courts.[19] Two men will face a "judge" and try to bedevil each other with sly questions and preposterous claims. The content of the dispute is of no matter; it may be sheer nonsense.

Amhara litigants are ingenious at expressing themselves. They do so with gestures, intonation, and timing that achieve considerable dramatic effect. They are delighted to perform at the slightest provocation. The following incident, recorded during a morning at court in Manz, illustrates that dimension of Amhara litigation which consists of the inherently gratifying expression of oral aggression:

> The defendant had been accused of plowing the plaintiff's land without permission. In fact, however, the plaintiff had given the defendant previous permission to plow there—in front of a group of elders who testified accordingly. The judge therefore ruled against the plaintiff. The plaintiff said he would appeal this decision, because the permission he granted had not been registered in the governor's office and, besides, he had some other complaint to bring against the defendant.
>
> At this point someone in the audience rose and said: "That is all. The judge has ruled against you, and the case is finished." Whereupon the plaintiff told this speaker that he should keep quiet, that his speaking out was against the law, that he had bothered him when the case was tried before a lower level judge previously and should bother him no more. Instead of hushing up, the speaker left his position against the wall and stood next to the defendant, asserting that he would speak in behalf of the latter.
>
> The plaintiff then accused this man of talking out of turn. The judge acknowledged this accusation and called for witnesses. Instantly half a dozen or more men jumped to their feet, eyes bursting with excitement and pride as before a battle, and volunteered to witness against the speaker. One by one, with a great show of oratory, they said their pieces against the man who had spoken out of turn. More than once the judge had to urge these witnesses to stop talking after the evidence had been presented. By this time the substance of the original dispute seemed to have been completely forgotten.

Oral Ambivalence

Much as the oral zone is favored by the Amhara as a center for positive gratifications, both of the passive-receptive and the active-aggressive sort, such